## WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 1850.

Mr. TURNEY. Mr. President, my object is not so much to discuss the particular merits of the amendment as it is to notice an article relating to myself, and others who act with me, which appeared in the "Union" of yesterday. I, with others, an arraigned before the country as being opposed to this bill, upon the simple ground of the particular provision which it is proposed by the Senator from Mississippi to amend. But I will read an extract of the article. It says:

"It is well known that the Clayton compromise received the votes of the strict State-rights men from the South in the Senate and in the House of Representatives; that the mass of Southern politicians, without distinction of party, voted against Mr. Stephens's motion to lay it on the table; that in the House of Representatives but eight Southern men sustained that motion—all of them Whigs—and that the South fully and entirely sustained the compromise, and denounced those who aided the North in defeating it as traitors to her cause. That compromise was passed to its third reading in the Senate of the United States by the following vote. We ask parular attention to the names recorded:
'The yeas were: Messrs. Atchison, Atherton, Benton,

Berrien, Borland, Breese, Bright, Butler, Calhoun, Clayton, Davis, of Mississippi, Dickinson, Douglas, Downs, Foote, Hannegan, Houston, Hunter, Johnson, of Maryland, Johnson, of Louisiana, Johnson, of Georgia, King, Lewis, Mangum, Mason, Phelps, Rusk, Sebastian, Spruance, Sturgeon, Tur-

ney, Westcott, and Yulee.

"Among the nays we see the names of Messrs. Baldwin, Corwin, Davis, of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dix, Hale, and Niles, the Van Buren Free-soiler. These men are consistent. How comes it, then, that Messrs. Borland, Butler, Davids of the State of the State

tent. How comes it, then, that Messra. Borland, Butter, Davis, of Mississippi, Hunter, Mason, Turney, and Yulee vote with them now? But we anticipate, and therefore we ask two other questions. They are—

"1. What propositions relative to slavery were these gentlemen voting for in 1848? and

"2. What proposition relative to slavery is now pending before the National Legislature?

"We will answer these questions by stating the provisions touching slavery in the new Territories, embodied in the touching slavery in the new Territories, embodied in the Clayton compromise; and then, by stating the provisions touching the same subject, embodied in the plan of adjustment

now before Congress.

"Looking to the Clayton compromise, which passed through
the Senate by the vote we have given above, we find the following provision relative to the Territorial Governments
therein established, to wit, that the legislative power of the

\*\* Shall have power to pass any law for the administration of justice in said Territory which shall not be repugnant to this act, or inconsistent with the laws and constitution of the this act, or inconsistent with the laws and constitution of the United States. But no law shall be passed respecting an establishment of religion, or respecting slavery, or interfering with the primary disposal of the soil; and no tax shall be imposed upon the property of the United States; nor shall the lands or other property of non-residents be taxed higher than the lands or other property of residents. All the laws shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States, and, if disapproved, shall be null and void. "Such is the Clayton compromise as far as the slavery

'and, if disapproved, shall be null and void.'

"Such is the Clayton compromise, as far as the slavery question is concerned, and for which the gentlemen whose names we have given recorded their votes, about 8 o'clock A. M. on Thursday, July the 27th, 1848.

"Let us now examine the provision touching slavery embodied in the proposed adjustment, which some of those same gentlemen now oppose with bitter vehemence. It reads as follows, applying to Utah and New Mexico:

""Ind be it further enacted, That the legislative power of the Territory shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation consistent with the constitution of the United States and the provisions of this act; but no law shall be passed interfering with the primary disposal of the soil, nor in respect to African slavery; no tax shall be imposed upon the property of the United States; nor shall the lands or other property of non-residents be taxed higher than the lands or property of non-residents be taxed higher than the lands or other property of residents. All the laws passed by the le-gislative assembly and governor shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States, and, if disapproved, shall be

Now, we ask our readers to compare this provision with that we have quoted from the Clayton compromise of 1848, and tell us the difference between them, so far as the question and tell us the difference between them, so far as the question of slavery is concerned. We have compared them carefully, for the purpose of detecting any discrepancy; and after mature deliberation we can see nothing, except that the Clayton compromise forbids the passage of any law 'respecting slavery,' while the proposed adjustment forbids the passage of any law 'in respect to African slavery.' We must confess it requires better eyes, or worse than ours, to see any real difference between the two provisions." ence between the two provisions."

I propose to show that the allegation is palpably untrue In fact, so far as the reason of my opposition is concerned, I assert it to be positively untrue. Although I am in favor of ent proposed by the honorable Senator from Mississippi, yet if that amendment should fail, and other impor-tant amendments be made, I will give my vote for the bill, however important I regard the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi.

The editor of the Union places himself before the country

as a sort of high-priest of the Democratic party, and proposes to read out of it certain members of that party because they choose not to obey his dictation and commands; because they choose to think and act for themselves; because they choose ago, and very correctly places my vote in favor of its passage. And be then propounds the interrogatory, "What is there in this bill in relation to the great question of slavery that was not in the bill for which these gentlemen voted two years He then goes on, and attempts to show that the two s are precisely the same, and that there is in fact but the difference of one word, according to his account. He professes to give an account from the record, which I shall show mystery if I were to be thus arrayed. Mr. Ritchie seems to have forgotten that "those who live in glass houses ought differences, then, in point of fact between this bill and the not to throw stones." Where does he stand ' Where is he one for which I voted, the "Clayton compromise bill," two now to be found? Where is he who arraigns me and others! years ago? Why, sir, that was exclusively a Territorial bill.

This is a Territorial bill and a State bill—a bill to admit a State is not side by side with the distinguished Senator from Kenas well as to provide governments for the Territories. The former was nothing more nor less than a Territorial bill; and sachusetts, (Mr. CLAT,) and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, (Mr. Webster,) for they would not let him its only provision was to create Territorial Governments for stand there, but he is attempting to hang on to their coatthe Territories of Oregon, California, and New Mexico. tails. [Laughter.] He has forgotten his old position. He That bill was founded, in my judgment, upon the non-inter has left his old friends. He, too, is found in strange compaference doctrine fully and completely, and prevented the Territerial Government from legislating upon the subject of excluding slavery from the Territories, leaving the rights of the better look a little at home, and see how he stands in rela-Southern people dependant upon the constitutional laws of the United States, upon which we were then and are now perfectly willing to risk our rights. If we have no constitutional rights, there is no use in saying any thing about the we shall stand as wide apart as the poles. How long is it matter, as I have no hopes of any justice at the hands of the since Mr. Ritchie was rallying and fighting under the banner North. But if we have constitutional rights, we desire that they should be protected and given to us. The Clayton compromise bill did this. It stood upon the non-intervention doctrine. It provided a speedy remedy for the adjustment of compromise bill did this. It stood upon the non-intervention doctrine. It provided a speedy remedy for the adjustment of the question whether slavery should or should not exist in the Territories. That bill left the matter to the Supreme (Court, and thus every right given by the constitution was completely secured to the South.

How is it in relation to the bill now before us? For I propose to respond very briefly to the interrogatory put by the wery recently, when he found it was expedient to denounce would-be high priest of the Democratic party. How does this bill stand? Why, sir, there is a provision for the admission of a State into the Union, and that State, too, containing the identical territory to which the Clayton bill gave a Territorial Government, and embracing all the territory which I regard to be of much consequence or importance, with a provision prohibiting slavery within the limits of that State. But if that were all, the bill would not be so very objectionable. But, further, what is the measure into the support of which Mr. Ritchie tries to whip the Democractic party in this body. This bill includes territory enough within the limits of the proposed State of California to constitute at the lowest calculation three States, one or two of them south of the Missouri compromise line, 36% 30' And this, too, when it is proposed that this State of Californis, with this immense boundary, shall be admitted not for the purpose of its remaining one State, for no man contemplates any such thing. None believe that California is to remain for all time to come one State, with such immense limits. The friends of the bill contemplate no such thing. The chairman of the committee that reported this bill has portant purpose of the Wilmot proviso to the surplus terri-California would never give her consent to forming a slave beneficial and just one.

State out of her territory, after she herself had been admitted Mr. President, I have now answered the main points in as a free State. I take it, then, that so far as the admission the charge of Mr. Ritchie against me and others, and have is nothing less than the Wilmot proviso in its most effective, and therefore most odious and offensive form. Offensive, because, being in the form of a State, we cannot test its constitu-tionality, as we could and would do if applied to a Territorial In other words, the only mode by which any thing in oppogovernment, and yet the effect, if not the exclusive object, is sition to this measure can reach the people is by a speech deto exclude slavery from territory hereafter to be admitted as a

from Texas some ten degrees of territory, and enough of it south of 36° 30' to form at least two additional States, which, if permitted to remain in the State of Texas, would remain slave territory, and which, if admitted into the Union from the State of Texas, will inevitably be admitted as slave States the State of Texas, will inevitably be admitted as slave States. But if we take them from under the constitution of Texas, and put them into a Territory subject to the Wilmot proviso, we would enlarge the subject of contention, and they will be finally admitted as free States. Here is a proposition, then, which did not exist in the Clayton compromise bill, of taking from under a slave constitution ten degrees of territory, and converting it into free soil. There was no such proposition as that in the Clayton compromise bill. And what further is there in this bill? True, the amount of money to be paid for converting this slave territory into free ferritory is left there in this bill? True, the amount of money to be paid for converting this slave territory into free territory is left blank—ten or fifteen millions will, perhaps, be proposed. It is, then, proposed to make the people of the South pay ten or fifteen millions—and to pay it for what purpose? for what benefit? In order that this immense territory shall be taken from them and converted into free territory. Mr. Ritchie can see nothing in all this; he cannot, for his life, perceive and difference between this hill and the Claston compromise. any difference between this bill and the Clayton compre

Mr. Ritchie publishes an extract from the Clayton compro mise bill, and then from the bill now under consideration The extract which he publishes from the Clayton compromis bill, reads as follows:

"No law shall be passed respecting the establishment of religion, or respecting slavery, or interfering with the primary disposal of the public lands."

He says that the only difference between the two bills the insertion of the word "African" before the word "slavery" in the bill now under consideration. He then goes on to show that this is the only difference between the two pro-

Mr. President, I propose to show that there are palpable errors—to call them by no worse name—in this bill. The only difference that Mr. Ritchie can perceive between the two bills is that in one bill the Territorial Legislature was pro-hibited from legislating "on the subject of slavery," and in the other "on the subject of African slavery." at the Clayton compromise bill, a true copy of which I have procured from the Secretary, I find that the provision is in these words :

"But no law shall be passed respecting the prohibition of stablishment of African slavery.

The Clayton compromise bill was reported in language identical to that of the bill now under consideration. The Senate, including myself among others, was dissatisfied with this identical language, which Mr. Ritchie has fallen so deep ly in love with. A majority of the Senate, being diss with the language of that bill as reported, struck it out, and inserted what I have just read to the Senate. Mr. Ritchie did not then undertake to denounce the whole Senate for thus amending the bill. He did not then perceive that the Senate had done wrong. He did not then complain of the action of the Senate; but now, sir, he complains most lustily, and he gives us what he calls a true record, when it turns out that he has not examined the record, or, if he has examined it, that he has given a false and untrue account of it.

Mr. Ritchie, at his own pleasure, assigns reasons for the conduct of gentlemen who have acted with me in opposition to this bill. I would repeat that, so far as I am individually concerned, the reasons assigned by him are untrue, and have not the semblance of truth to sustain them. I consider the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi as a great improvement of the bill; but my vote shall not depend upon the adoption of that amendment, because if it be rejected, and other important amendments be made, I shall vote for the bill. But, sir, Mr. Ritchie proceeds in his article and says :

"This is history, for it is derived from the public records; and yet, strange to say, some of the gentlemen who, less than two years ago, sustained the Clayton compromise, and denounced before their Southern constituencies those who denounced before their Southern constituencies those who defeated that compromise, are now moving heaven and earth to defeat an adjustment, giving, as their principal reason, a clause identical with the similar clause of the Clayton compromise. Taking all these things into consideration, what are we to think? The friends of the proposed adjustment have expressly told its enemies from the South, that they were willing to strike out the feature touching slavery, which some gentlemen from the South (who had voted for the same feature in the Clayton compromise) objected to and that they ture in the Clayton compromise) objected to, and that they were willing to remove their new-found objections, by admitting Mr. Pratt's amendment. But even that has not proved mitting Mr. Pratt's amendment. But even that has not proved satisfactory. It is all a mystery—all a mystery—which arrays Southern State-rights men in the Senate side by side with Messrs. Hale, Chase, and Seward, under the lead of Colonel Benton, and arrays Southern State-rights men in the House of Representatives by the side of Root, Wentworth, Wilmot, and Horace Mann, under the lead of Joshua R. Giddings. ?!

Sir, it is not true, either that we are attempting to move heaven and earth. We are not so vain, or so wicked as to attempt either. How Mr. Ritchie should ascertain that I was opposed to the bill, is a matter wholly unknown to me. Certainly I made no speech here against it; certainly I have not heretofore expressed my opposition to it, in the course of this debate. I have never before opened my mouth in rela-tion to the subject, except in relation to the report of the Committee of Thirteen, which constitutes no part of the bill. Yet Mr. Ritchie assumes to assign for my opposition a reason which I repudiated, and which I shall show to be untrue. The article then proceeds to say, " taking all these things into consideration, what are we to think?" is a pretty hard question to answer, what we are to think, In that article he has printed the vote on what is called the Clayton compromise bill, which passed this body two years well exclaim in his own language, "that in view of all these things, what are we to think?" [Laughter.] He then goes

"It is all a mystery—all a mystery, which arrays Southern States-rights men in the Senate side by side with Messrs. Hale, Chase, and Seward, under the lead of Col. Benton.

Well, Mr. President, I should regard it as a very great f the course of the Senator from Missouri. Nothing of the kind could ever find its way into Mr. Ritchie's paper until others if they gave a solitary vote with him. Does he not know that Mr. BENTON approves every word in this bill, and would support every provision of the bill if presented as separate measures, and that he only objects because they are blended in one bill? So that, in substance and measures, Mr. Ritchie is acting with Col. BENTON, while I, for the sake of principle, am fighting them both. He denounces me for voting with Col. BENTON.

In relation to those other gentlemen enumerated here with whom it is alleged I stand side by side, I deny it; I repudiate them. I have one declaration to make to Mr. Ritchie and to the country, and I hope that my constituents will read it and ponder over it, and if it is unworthy of their representativ they will repudiate me. I stand here to advocate and defend their rights, and in the examination of great measures and great principles, I am not to be induced to vote in a particular way because that would bring me in company with particular gentlemen. I am not one of those who would vote against a bill because certain other gentlemen chose to vote for it. I would rather act with Satan himself, and be right, prociaimed to the Senate, and to the country, that at a subsequent period, whenever it may be deemed necessary, other shall examine all measures submitted for my action in this States may be admitted from the State of California. In the mean time the constitution of that State is to answer the im- to my judgment of the merits of every measure, without looktory within that State. That constitution is to prohibit slavery, and make it perfectly certain that whatever States may be formed out of California, they will come into the that they can be rallied for or against a measure on account of Union as free States; for it is provided by the constitution of the men who vote for or against it. Sir, he is mistaken. He the United States that no State shall be divided into two or more States without the assent of said State. It would then measures for themselves. The people will form their opinrequire the assent of both States—that is, of the people forming the new State to be admitted from California as well as they will never fail to use every effort to prevent the passage of the people of the State of California. The State of of an obnoxious or unjust law, or to secure the passage of

of California is concerned, with her present boundaries, it answered them truly, at all events. I am willing to go before State or States There is, then, some difference between the and that, I believe, stands neutral on this question—every Clayton compromise bill, and that now before us, called by press, or the two prominent presses, are out in favor of this measure. All three were in favor of it at one time. This The Clayton compromise bill left Texas the enjoyment of the rightful boundaries. It only proposed to provide govern
measure. All three were in favor of it at one time. This take in regard to the character of the measure before this body. It happens not to be a party measure at all. It chances to be been rightful boundaries. It only proposed to provide govern
zestou- for it, and has even denounced Southern Democrats a measure above party, and in relation to which it is the

servant does not belong to the latter, nothing does; as to the judges, their decisions may be carried to the Supreme Court, and reversed or affirmed, as may be proper. And, so far as reversed or affirmed, as may be proper. And, so far as reversed or affirmed, as may be proper. And, so far as reversed or affirmed, as may be proper. And, so far as reversed or affirmed, as may be proper. And, so far as reversed or affirmed, as may be proper. And, so far as reversed or affirmed, as may be proper. And, so far as reversed or affirmed, as may be proper. And, so far as reversed or affirmed, as may be proper. And, so far as reversed or affirmed, as may be proper. And, so far as reversed or affirmed, as may be proper. And, so far as reversed or affirmed, as may be proper. And, so far as reversed or affirmed, as may be proper. And, so far as reversed or affirmed, as may be proper. And, so far as the party because they will not blindly support a measure which their judgments condemn. How stands this matter? What is the relative strength of the bill with the Southern reverse to read them out of population. It will know, of Mr. Ritchie. He attempts to read them out of opinion, I well know, of Mr. Ritchie. He attempts to read them out of population. It will know, of Mr. Ritchie. He attempts to read them out of population. It will know, of Mr. Ritchie. He attempts to read them out of population. It will know, of Mr. Ritchie. He attempts to read them out of population. It will know, of Mr. Ritchie. He attempts to read them out of the party because they will not blindly support a measure which their judgments condemn. How stands this matter? What is the relative strength of the bill with the southern reversed or affirmed, as may be proper. And, so far as the party because they will not blindly support a measure which their judgments condemn. The class of the party because they will not blindly support a measure which the party because they will not blindly support as measure. The does not read them out of the party because they Democracy in this body? According to my estimate there can be found but five Southern Democrats in favor of it. There are certainly eleven opposed to it. And while there are eleven against and five for the position of Mr. Ritchie he undertakes to denounce the eleven, and read them out of the

party.

Mr. FOOTE. Will the honorable Senator allow me for a

Mr. TURNEY. Certainly. Mr. FOOTE. If I understand their position, not one of the honorable Senators from the South, to whom allusion has been made, has declared himself to be entirely opposed to this measure. They were all very particular in declaring that if certain amendments were made they would favor the measure. I now beg leave to say to the honorable Senator that, so far as Tam concerned, I am in favor of amendments, and have been from the beginning of this controversy down to the pre-sent moment. If reasonable amendments be made, I hope there will not be the least difference between the different Democratic Senators from the South on this measure. If the honorable Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Soule) was correctly understood the other day, he was very far from being opposed to this measure toto cœlo, but declared himself to be in favor of it if certain amendments were made. I do not believe that there is one man on this side of the house who will not support this measure in the event of such amendments made as will render it acceptable to all.

Mr. TURNEY. Mr. President, I really do not see the

point of the explanation, neither can I conceive why it was necessary to interrupt me in order to make the explanation. I was speaking of Mr. Ritchie's article against me and others.

Mr. FOOTE. Did you not speak of Senators from the

Mr. TURNEY. I spoke of Senators from the South with view only to show the number for and against the bill, and I repeated at least half a dozen times that I would be satisfied with the bill if certain amendments be made. I have gone further. I have gone on to show that, even if this amendment of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Davis) be rejected, yet if other important amendments be made I shall vote for the bill. I want to know who are the friends of the bill and who are not. When we speak of a bill, we speak not of a bill as it may be amended, but as it is on the table. I would say that there is not a man in America who would oppose this bill if it should be so amended as to suit his coneniences and views; not one. When I speak of this bill, I speak of it as it is, not of it as it may be amended or changed, or then it may become an entire new bill. Mr. FOOTE. I am sorry to be under the necessity of in-

terrupting the honorable gentlemen sgain. Does the honorable Senator from Tennessee wish to be understood as declaring that, in his opinion, any friend of this bill has opposed reasonable amendments? Does he not know, does not the country know, that the honorable chairman of the committee thirteen, in the beginning, and ever since, has offered no opposition to reasonable amendments? Has not the honora-ble Senator from Michigan (Mr. Cass) said the same? Have we not all said the same precisely? Have not those us who are in favor of the measure expected that modifications would made? Several, including myself, have declared their determination, at a seasonable time, to offer amendments? I inderstand, then, from the indications around me, that there will be no opposition to the bill, of an inflexible character, if be properly amended Mr. TURNEY. I do not know exactly what the Senator

the merits of the bill as it may be after it shall have been amended, but as t is now. How are we to discuss what the bill will be after i shall have been amended, when we do not know how it wil be amended? I was not speaking of the conduct of Senatos at all. I was speaking of the course of this high priest, or rather of this man who would be highpriest of the Democratic party. He seems to speak, or assumes to speak, by authority; and that authority is that no amendment will be made. He has denounced us because we want amendments tt this bill. We are denounced because we will not vote for this bill unless it be amended, not because we are not in favor of passing some bill. We are denounced be-cause we do not take this bill as it is, as it comes from the hands of the committee. That is what we are denounced for. It was to that pint, and to that point alone, that I was calling the attention of the Senate and of the country. I am anxious to vote fo the settlement and adjustment of the whole question, and an anxious to vote for this bill, if it be mended so as to make it acceptable to me. I have written letters home to this effect. I have gone so far as to express the hope that amendments would be made which would enable me, and all other true men of the South, to give this bill our hearty support. I have expressed this hope in letters to my constituents. I did not harge any one here with a desire to defeat amendments. I im willing to believe, and hope, that a majority will be found n favor of placing the bill in a shape to make it acceptable to the Southern people; but whether the friends of the bill wil permit it to be so amended, time alone will show. What, let me ask, is the great bone of contention? What do the Southern people desire?—I mean hose of them that act with me, and entertain my opinions. Is there any man in the South, to be found any where, call him a Calhounist, call him a disunionist, or any other opprobrious term, if you choose—I challenge Mr. Ritchie, and others who take his position, to point me to a solitary man who acts with me, who demands for the South any more than the constitution advanced or advocated by the Southern people? No, sir; far from it. All they ask, and all they ever have asked, is their constitutional rights: that they shall be a series of the serie their constitutional rights; that they shall be permitted to enter the Territories with their property, upon an equal footing and with equal rights with their brethren of the free States. This is all they ask. They ask no more than that. And any body who supposes that the South will submit to any thing less, greatly underestimates the people of the South. They claim to be freemen, and they claim that the constitution was as much made for them as for the people of the

But Mr. Ritchie says that the integrity and nationality of the Democratic party must be preserved, and it can only be preserved by a total sacrifice of all these rights of the Southsacrifice, does he hold me up and denounce me.

Now, I ask what Senators mean when they talk to you of extreme South and of extreme Southern men? men point me to any unreasonable demand made by Southern men? The constitution of the country makes them equal to the North, and they would be degraded and disgraced, were they to consent to be any thing less. I hope they will never consent to surrender any portion of their constitutional

Mr. Ritchie has taken occasion, also, to denounce the Mis souri compromise line. He denounces it, and denounces all those who advocate it. Why, sir, Mr. Ritchie has gone for north of 36° 30 himself. Reduce California to the line of 36° 30'; run the line through Texas; compensate Texas for whatever you may purchase of her territory; and then organize Territorial Governments founded upon the non-inrvention doctrine, and I will vote for the bill. Will we gain nothing by that ' We know that we will gain at least wo Southern States in Texas. There will be no dispute in relation to that. If that part of the territory of Texas remain under a slave constitution, be kept under it, it will come into the Union as a slave State. We know that, and we know further, from the signs of the times, that if this part of the territory of Texas be taken from her, and put under the erritorial form of government, it is destined to come into the Inion as a free State. There is the power to accomplish it. If the Southern boundary of California be reduced to the line of 36° 30', territory enough will be left south of that line to form one State at least, with an equal chance of making it a slave State, which is all that the South can ask or demand. There is not a Southern man who would demand to the letter he constitutional rights of the South. I defy Mr. Ritchie, I defy any one else, to designate a solitary man in the South who demands his full share of constitutional right. If the South were to demand that, they would not only demand that the Wilmot proviso should not be spread over the Territories, but they would require that any obstruction, any difficulties, growing out of any doubt in relation to the laws of Mexico. ought to be removed at once, and that the right to carry slaves into the Territories should be recognised by this Government. They would do this, if they demanded all their constitutional rights as equal citizens of this Union. I undertake to say, therefore, that Mr. Ritchie has no right to read two thirds of the Democratic party of the South out of that party for differing with him, and for maintaining the rights of the South. I believe that the Democratic party are governed by democratic republican doctrines. We might have a right to turn Mr. Ritchie out, but he has none to expel us. I shall, therefore, still regard myself as belonging to the Democratic party, and shall continue to act with it, regardless of Mr. Ritchie. I will conclude, by saying that I nope and trust the time is not far distant when there will be a ress in the city of Washington that will do some little justice to the people of the South, and will appeal to the country in their behalf.

Mr. FOOTE. I do not rise to address the Senate at any

length, as I am exceedingly anxious that we should proceed to the vote without delay; nor shall I enter at all into the general merits of the pending controversy. But I feel bound to say a few words in vindication of Mr. Ritchie, who is, as we all know, so eminently able to defend himself as to most of the allegations which have been made against him. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee, in response to one of the last of his remarks, that he need be under no apprehension of being read out of the Democratic party by Mr. Ritchie. Mr. Ruchie has never undertaken to do it, or thought of doing it. The honorable Senator has made a great mis take in regard to the character of the measure before this body.

measure. He does not treat it as a party measure. He would scorn to speak upon it as a party measure. He looks upon it as a great measure of conciliation and adjustment, in which all patriots, wherever located or however associated politically, are bound to unite, and in support of which the whole country, with slight and most lamentable exceptions, concurs.

Mr. TURNEY. I have only to inquire, that if Mr. Ritchie does not regard it as a party measure, why does he decounced.

does not regard it as a party measure, why does he denounce only the Democratic Senators who oppose it, whilst he makes no comment on the course of other gentlemen who do not support the measure? I think the Senator from Mississippi

cannot have read the article.

Mr. FOOTE. I have read the whole of the article, and I eg leave to say that the Senator's course in reference to this matter appears to me to be somewhat inconsistent. He first charges Mr. Ritchie with being the advocate and the editorial champion of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. CLAY,) whose party position is perfectly well known to be adverse to that of Mr. Ritchie; and, after so doing, he alleges that Mr. Ritchie is endeavoring to read gentlemen out of the Demo-Ritchie is endeavoring to read gentlemen out of the Demo-cratic party because they do not support this measure. This charge of not being a true and loyal Democrat, because of not following the lead of the most distinguished Whig in the Union, appears to my apprehension to involve something like a gross confusion of ideas. This whole notion is founded in an error. Mr. Ritchie does not recognise the measure before us as a party measure, and has so over and over declared; but The PRESIDING OFFICER, (Mr. Kine,) called the

Senator to order for irrelevancy.

Mr. FOOTE. I simply wish to defend my venerable editorial friend, who has been very unkindly assailed. I am not going into the merits of the controversy between Mr. Ritchie and these gentlemen. No doubt Mr. Ritchie is perfectly prepared to meet them upon all the points involved, in a manner entirely satisfactory to the country; but I did not feel at lib-erty to remain entirely silent whilst a violent assault was being made upon the sensibility and character of a man whose wisdom, patriotism, inflexible regard for principle, and a thousand high moral qualities, had, in earlier and purer times, secured to him the friendship and esteem of such men as Jef-ferson, Madison, and other great and good men, now no longer upon earth, and who, I venture to predict, will descend to posterity as one worthy to be honestly remembered, when all the accusations of the present time shall have been disregarded and forgotten. To illustrate what I am now saying and to show how little danger there is of Mr. Ritchie's suff serious detriment from the decrial now in progress, I will violate in some degree the secresy of private interce that I have learned within a few days past that the present distin guished Governor of the Old Dominion was, not long since heard to say that he regarded the present position of the vene rable editor of the Union as one of more honor than any which he has ever heretofore held; and I know that a similar sentiment is most widely entertained by many of the most renowned statesmen and patriots to be found in the Republic. Sustained, confided in, and defended by such friends, he need dread no assailment that is threatened here or elsewhere, whe-

ther by speech or pen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER stated the discussion to out of order.

Mr. TURNEY. If Mr. Ritchie does not regard this as a party measure, I repeat, why does he denounce only the Demo-crats who are opposed to it. There is not a word said against other Senators. Not a whisper. I do not care what Mr. Ritchie's character may be. He may stand very high with means by inflexible opposition. I really do not know how to discuss the meris of a bill not before us. I will not discuss that he has given a fa'se account of the record. I have taken that he has given a fa'se account of the record. I have taken occasion to speak of these matters here in vindication of myself. It was my right, and I chose to exercise that right.

Mr. WALKER suggested whether it would not be in order o refer the matter relating to Mr. Ritchie to the Committee

on Printing? [Laughter.]
Mr. WHITCOMB then addressed the Senate for an hour. Mr. DICKINSON. I have but a word to say. It has eemed to me from the beginning that an undue con has been given to the section under consideration, and to both the amendments proposed to it. I do not favor the original section, which prohibits legislation in respect to African slavery, and shall vote to strike it out, but I shall vote for the bill if it is retained, because I deem the measure of so much consequence that I will not be turned from its support by de-tails of minor importance of which I do not approve. The tails of minor importance of which I do not approve. The Senator from Mississippi, (Mr. Davis,) notwithstanding the bill authorizes the Territorial Legislature to act upon all "rightful subjects of legislation," believes that certain police legislation, which he thinks may become necessary, may, by a strict construction of the section, be prohibited, and has proposed an amendment providing that nothing contained in hat section shall be construed to prevent proper legislation for the protection of every species of property there, or which may be carried there in conformity with the constitution and laws of the United States. I suppose this amendment cansot be necessary under any view of the case, since rightful subjects of legislation are provided for; but the Senator thinks it is, and I see no particular harm in it except that it makes provision for cases already sufficiently provided for. The Senator from Ohio (Mr. CHASE) then, to guard against any inference which may be drawn from the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi authorizing slavery, proposes to add a further proviso, that nothing therein contained shall be supposed by some, the ordinance of 1787 over again, but merely rebuts any inference authorizing slavery which the Senator guaranties. Is there any man that demands for the South | thinks may be drawn from the amendment of the Senator from more than equality with the people of the North? Has any Southern man proposed to exclude the Northern people from migrating to the Territories? Has any such idea as that been to rebut such presumption. Besides, as this is a proviso to corrected directly, by changing the language of ment, and not by explaining it by a further proviso. If I thought the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi could possibly be construed as is supposed, I would vote to change it, but I am sure it cannot, and that no amendment is re-

cessary. Now, sir, I wish to say, once for all, that it is not my inention, either directly or indirectly, to favor by voice or vote the extension of slavery or the restriction of slavery, in the Territories, by Congress, or any interference with the subject whatsoever. Nor am I influenced in this conclusion by the local laws of the Territory in question, either natural or artificial—the laws of nature or the laws of man; and, for all the purposes of present action, I will not inquire what they either respect. I will stand upon the true principles of non-intervention, in the broadest possible sense, for non-intervention's sake, to uphold the fundamental principles of reedom, and for no other reason, and will leave the people of the Territories and of the States to such rights and privieges as are theirs under the constitution and laws of the nited States, without addition to or diminution from such

rights by the action of Congress.

The question was then taken by yeas and nays on the nendment of Mr. CHASE, and resulted as follows : YEAS-Messrs. Baldwin, Bradbury, Bright, Chase, Clark

YEAS—Messrs. Baldwin, Bradbury, Bright, Chase, Clark, Cooper, Corwin, Davis, of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dodge, of Wisconsin, Douglas, Felch, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Miller, Norris, Seward, Shields, Smith, Spruance, Upham, Walker, Webster, and Whitcomb—25.

NAYS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Benton, Berrien, Butler, Cass, Clay, Clemens, Davis, of Mississippi, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge, of Iowa, Downs, Foote, Houston, Hunter, Jones, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Soule, Sturgeon, Turney, and Underwood—30.

So the amendment was not agreed to. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now curs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missis-

ippi.
The yeas and nays having been demanded, and ordered on

ais amendment, resulted as follows: 

nderwood-25. NAYS-Messrs. Baldwin, Benton, Bradbury, Bright, Cass. Chase, Clarke, Cooper, Corwin, Davis, of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dodge, of Wisconsin, Dodge, of Iowa, Douglas, Felch, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Jones, Miller, Norris, Seward, Shields, Smith, Spruance, Sturgeon, Upham, Walker, Webster, and Whitcomb—30.

So the amendment was not agreed to. Mr. SEWARD. I now submit the following amend-

ment, to be inserted at the thirty-eighth section:

"Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, otherwise than
by conviction for crime, shall ever be allowed in either of said
Territories of Utah and New Mexico." The question on the amendment of Mr. SEWARD was taken

The question on the amenament of Mr. Seward was taken by yeas and ways, and resulted as follows:
YEAS—Messrs. Baldwin, Bradbury, Bright, Chase, Clarke, Cooper, Corwin, Davis, of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dodge, of Wisconsin, Douglas, Felch, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Miller, Norris, Seward, Shields, Smith, Upham, Whitcomb, Walker 23.
NAYS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Benton, Berrien

Butler, Cass, Clay, Clemens, Davis, of Mississippi, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge, of Iowa, Downs, Foote, Houston, Hunter, Jones, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Soule, Spruance, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, Webster, Yulee—33. So the amendment was not agreed to. Mr. BERRIEN. I move to strike out in the sixth line of

the tenth section the words "in respect to," and insert the words "establishing or prohibiting." The section will then "But no law law shall be passed interfering with the primary disposal of the soil, nor establishing or prohibiting Afri-

The question, being taken on the amendment of Mr. BER-

RIEN, resulted as follows :

YEAS-Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Berrien, Borland YEAS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Berrien, Borland, Butler, Clay, Clemens, Davis, of Miss., Dawson, Dickinson, Downs, Foote, Houston, Hunter, Jones, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Soule, Sprusnee, Sturgeon, Turney, Webster, Yulee—30.

NAYS—Messrs. Baldwin, Benton, Bradbury, Bright, Cass,

So the amendment was adopted.

Mr. HALE. I propose to amend the section by adding, after the word "prohibiting," the words "or allowing."

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. HALE, and resulted as follows :

and resulted as follows:
YEAS—Messrs. Baldwin, Bradbury, Chase, Clarke.

YEAS—Messrs. Baldwin, Bradbury, Chase, Clarke, Corwin, Davis, of Massachusetts, Dayton, Dodge, of Wisconsin, Douglas, Felch, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Miller, Norris, Seward, Shields, Smith, Upham, Walker, Whitcomb—21.

NAYS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Benton, Berrien, Borland, Bright, Butler, Cass, Clay, Clemens, Cooper, Davis, of Mississippi, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge, of Iowa, Downs, Foote, Houston, Hunter, Jones, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Soule, Spruance, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, Webster, Yulee—36. So the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the metion to strike out the words "nor establishing or prohibiting African slavery." The question was then taken on the motion of Mr. Doug-LAS, to strike out the words "nor establishing nor prohibit-

ng African slavery ;" and it resulted as follows :

ing African slavery; and it resulted as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Bradbury, Cass, Chase, Clarke, Clay, Cooper, Corwin, Dickinson, Dodge, of Iowa, Douglas, Felch, Greene, Hamlin, Jones, Miller, Norris, Seward, Shields, Sturgeon, Underwood, Upham—21.

NAYS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Baldwin, Bell, Benton, Berrien, Borland, Bright, Butler, Clamens, Davis, of Missisippi, Dawson, Dodge, of Wisconsin, Downs, Foote, Hale, Houston, Hunter, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Soule, Spruance, Turney, Walker, Webster, Whitcomb, and Yulee—33.

Mr. WALKER | Deliver my amendment will now be

Mr. WALKER. I believe my amendment will now be order. I now move to amend the bill in the tenth section, y adding after the word "slavery" the following words:
And that peon slavery is forever abolished and prohibited."
Mr. HALE. I move to amend that amendment by striking ut the word "peon." [Laughter.]

Mr. WALKER. We have just voted on a proposition in egard to African slavery, and it has been rejected. There a species of slavery there which I think ought to be abolhed, and against which none has been more eloquent in his etamation than the honorable Senator from Louisiana. It s in regard to this species of slavery that I propose my amendent, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. BENTON. The amendment is well founded and deserves the attention of the Senate. With the view of showing this I will read from an ordinance passed at Monterey in relation to peonage :

"That no person whatever shall from henceforth hire or take into his service any Indian without a certificate from the former employer of that Indian stating that the said employer has no claims on the services of that Indian for wages ad-It is still stronger in the Spanish, the word amo, which is

translated "employer," corresponding with our words "master, owner, or proprietor." The ordinance in another clause then goes on to say : " Any person taking into his employment any Indian with-

Any person taking into his employment any indian with-out such certificate, and advancing any money or property to the said Indian, shall forfeit any money or property so advanc-ed; and if it should be proved that any Indian has been enticed, away from the service of his master, the person convicted of having so enticed him shall be liable to a fine not exceeding

This ordinance was issued at Monterey on the 11th of January, 1847. The word "slavery," which is in the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, I do not think is technically correct. I would suggest that the word " serviide" would be more technically correct. Mr. WALKER. I accept the suggestion of the Senato

Mr. PRATT. It occurs to me, Mr. President, that we have no legislative power to interfere with this subject. Slavery either exists there or it does not. This peonage, to which the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin was intended to apply, was servitude existing by virtue of the contract of the individuals. Here, then, is this servitude existing by the recognised law of that country. Now, what right has Congress to interfere with the vested rights of these people, and say that those rights shall not exist which are guarantied by the treaty between this country and Mexico?

But, sir, if this amendment is passed, if slavery or servi tude, either in the peon or the negro, is abolished there, must include the obligation on the part of this Government to pay the debt for which that servitude was pledged, or the va-lue of the African slave, if that species of slavery is to be abolished. I do, therefore, hope that this disposition to offer amendment after amendment, for the purpose of testing the same question sgain and again, will be resisted by the Senate, and that they will be voted down.

Mr. DAYTON. I feel the full force of the remarks which

have just fallen from my friend from Maryland, and it seems to me that they should arrest the attention of the Senate. It appears to me that we are proposing to interfere with vested rights, so far as I have any knowledge of this system of peonage. Now, sir, I think that whatever we may do as to the future, we should let the present stand. If it is in order now to move to amend the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, I will move to amend it by adding after the words "peon slavery," the words "growing out of or connected with any future contract," I propose that as an amendment, construed to authorize slavery, &c. This is not, as has been and, if it should be agreed to, the whole amendment can be

voted down, if it be deemed necessary.

Mr. WALKER. I do not know what the Senator from Maryland intended to imply by Senators moving the same question again and again, but I can assure him that my motive was not to reach the question of African slavery under this guise. I assure the Senator and the country that I had no such intention whatever.

One other observation. As I understand peon service it is a kind of a modified form of imprisonment for debt. Now, we know that the Congress of the United States has heretofore abolished the system of imprisonment for debt. In the case of these peons they are obliged to work for a certain master, to whom they are confined, and imprisonment for debt is only being confined to certain limits. Congress has already exercised jurisdiction in abolishing imprisonment for debt, and as we are now legislating for a Territory under a doctrine which has already been decided, I think we may clearly exercise this power. However, I am willing to defer to the opinions of those who are more enlightened on this subjec-

On motion of Mr. CLEMENS, the Senate then adjourned

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 1850.

On motion of Mr. McLANE, of Maryland, the House re-solved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. Boyn, of Kentucky, in the chair,) and resumed the consideration of the message of the President transmitting the constitution of the State of California.

Mr. JONES, (Mr. DUNHAM, who was entitled to the floor yielding,) said that he did not intend to attempt to make a speech upon this subject or the pending question. He proposed at this time to offer a proposition, or to give notice of what he would offer when it should be in order, which would clearly and definitely indicate his position in regard to this momentous question. He desired a settlement, whether it had the effect to make or unmake great men or aspirants, and wished to restore peace and harmony to a distracted country. He now moved, in lieu of the bill of the gentleman from Wis consin, (Mr. Dorr,) the following bill. If it was not in order, he would give notice that he would offer it when it should be in order. It was similar to the bill reported by Mr. CLAY, in the Senate, to admit California and to form Ter ritorial Governments for Utah and New Mexico.

His proposition was to strike out of the bill of the Senate, s ten and twenty-seven, (these sections being similar to each other, defining the legislative powers of the Territories of Utah and New Mexico,) in the following paragraph, the words "nor in respect to African slavery:

"But no law shall be passed interfering with the primar isposal of the soil, nor in respect to African slavery." He also proposed to strike out, in that part of the bill in relation to the claim of Texas to New Mexico, in the paragraph defining the boundary of Texas as "beginning at the point on the Rio del Norte, commonly called El Paso, and running up that river twenty miles, measured by a straight line thereon," the words "commonly called El Paso, and running up that river twenty miles, measured by a straight line thereon," and insert in lieu thereof the words "where

the 34th degree of north latitude crosses said river." He proposed, also, to add to the sixth section (which provides that if the "State of Texas shall refuse or decline to accede to the preceding articles they shall become null and void, and the United States shall be remitted back to all their territorial rights in the same state and condition as if these srticles of compact had never been tendered to the acceptance of the State of Texas") the following provise:

"Provided, That rothing in this act contained shall be so construed as in any manner to impair the right of the State of Texas to all the ter tory as claimed by her, in the event that the terms proposed o said State of Texas should not be secretical."

He said that he would merely remark, in presenting this, that in his opinion it was the only practicable proposition that was now or had been before Congress. He would, as an alternative, take the Missouri compromise; but would prefer this to that. He believed at this time to advocate the Missouri compromise was to oppose the settlement of this agitating question.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the amendment was not no

n order, there being previous amendments pending.
Mr. DUNHAM then took the floor, and occupied his hour

n a speech on the subject of slavery.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Tennessee, also spoke an hour in reply to a speech of Mr. Winterder, made some time since, and also on the responsibility of the Whig party for the an-

nexation of Texas.

Mr. McLEAN, of Kentucky, and Mr. HOAGLAND, each spoke an hour, and then the House adjourned.

## THE PUBLIC PRINTING.

IN SENATE, JUNE 7, 1850.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I am charged with the petition of Wm. A. Belt, one of the contractors for the public printing of the two Houses of Congress. I have read the petition, and it sets forth in substance the inability of the contractor to continue the public printing upon the terms of his contract. Upon conversation with the Senator who is at the head of the Committee on Printing, (Mr. Borland,) I learn from him that the committee have some time since had this head of the Committee on Printing, (Mr. Borland,) I learn from him that the committee have some time since had this subject of the condition of the public printing before them, and that their deliberations resulted in the resolutions reported by them to the Senate some time since, to which an amendment was offered by the chairman of the committee himself. Those resolutions, in substance, recommend that the contract under which the public printing is now executed should be abrogated upon terms set forth in the resolutions, but the Senate has not yet acted upon those resolutions. The object of the petitioner in presenting this memorial to Congress, as he informs me, is to bring to the attention of the Senate for its consideration the fact that it will be out of his power toits consideration the fact that it will be out of his power to continue the public printing upon the terms of the present contract, and that with every disposition, as stated in the petition, to discharge the duties which he has assumed, he will be disabled from doing it, in order that the Senate may take such action on the subject as the Senate world.

will be disabled from doing it, in order that the Senate may take such action on the subject as the Senate may deem proper. He has expressed in the petition and in conversation with me extreme reluctance to discontinue the public printing, as it might be considered disrespectful towards the Senate, and he desires to lay before that body the reasons why he is disabled from fulfilling his contract, and to ask the consideration of the subject, and that a proper remedy may be provided.

Mr. M. then read the material parts of the following petition.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives

of the United States.

The undersigned begs leave most respectfully to represent that he became the contractor for certain classes of the public printing under the joint set of the two houses of Congress, passed the third day of August, eighteen hundred and forty-site.

passed the third day of August, eighteen induced and forty-six.

Before entering into the contract, he considered the means which he might command, and they were, the materials, presses, and other means at the Union Office where the work has en executed. ose means were supposed to be fully adequate to the un

Those means were supposed to be fully adequate to the undertaking, and he is yet convinced that, under ordinary circumstances, the contractor would have been able to execute the contract to the entire satisfaction of Congress, by a prompt delivery of all the work which was stipulated to be performed. He is prepared to show, by unquestionable evidence, that every endeavor has been made to execute the contract faithfully; and that the public work has never been executed better, if so well, and never more promptly, than during the present session, notwithstanding the extraordinary impediments to which the work has been subjected. Of these facts he speaks with undoubting confidence.

He admits that there has been an apparent delay in the execution of the work; but it has arisen from causes altogether beyond the control of the contractor. With as large an office,

He admits that there has been an apparent delay in the execution of the work; but it has arisen from causes altogether beyond the control of the contractor. With as large an office, and as ample materials as have ever been heretofore employed to execute the public printing; with as extensive arrangements for press work, and for obtaining paper, as were thought sufficient to do the work in good manner and in good time, the contractor has been prevented from delivering the public documents as rapidly as was anxiously desired, through a concurrence of causes over which he could exercise no control.

First among these causes was the loss of more than three weeks before the manuscripts were received, owing to the want of organization in the House of Representatives; secondly, the great variety of the documents; thirdly, their unusual length; fourthly, the unprecedented number of extra copies which were ordered to be struck, (of the two volumes of Executive Papers, for example, 28,000 copies; of the Treasury Report, 83,000; fittly, the loss of four or five weeks in the binding after they were printed, a thing which has never been done before; sixthly, the detention of engravings. Congress is assured, in the most earnest manner, that these are the causes which have kept back the work, and not any sinister design, as has been insinuated, to effect any selfish object.

It is most respectfully stated to your honorable bodies, that the contract is a losing and almost a ruinous one; that several thousands of dollars have already been sunk, and that, even if the contractor had the most effective means to go on with the work, the contract is calculated to involve him in serious loss; therefore, with every confidence in the justice of Congress, he appeals to them for relief.

work, the contract is calculated to involve him in serious 1038; therefore, with every confidence in the justice of Congress, he appeals to them for relief.

Had the terms of the contract been more liberal, the contractor would have been enabled to obtain additional force, material, and press power to enable him to execute promptly when the unprecedented amount of work which was ordered.

even the unprecedented amount of work which was ordered.

But, as his contract was a losing one, it was not in his power to make more extensive arrangements, and he tho was discharging his whole duty, under the circumstan executing his work as well and more rapidly than it had ever been executed by others, under more favorable terms and more propitious circumstances. He was forced, besides, to keep in his employment a large number of hands for a considerable period of time, without having any thing for them to do, because of the delay in organizing the House of Representatives. And the contingent fund of both Houses being exhausted, he could not obtain compensation according to the stipulations of his contract for his work as it was delivered; and he was thereby forced to obtain means at heavy cost from other sources, in order to enable him to fulfil his undertaking. These facts are urged by the undersigned, in the full belief that your honorable bodies will regard them as ample and satisfactory reasons why the contractor did not, and could not, employ additional means to execute the public printing with more rapidity.

The undersigned begs leave further to state, that when it was ascertained that the work ordered by Congress was greater than the means at his disposal would allow him to execute, with that promptness which the public interests demanded, and when he received the transport to the strength of the contractor did not have the public interests demanded, and when he received the transport to the strength of the contractor of the co executing his work as well and more rapidly than it had ever

when he perceived that the circumstances already detailed made it impossible for him to procure additional torce, matemade it impossible for him to procure additional force, material, and press power, he promptly informed the honorable chairman of the Senate's committee on public printing (who had most liberally addressed him on the subject) of the situation in which he was placed; and he put it within the power of the committee to abrogate the contract, and make whatever arrangements might be deemed necessary to promote the public interests.

Having done that, the contractor has been led to believe, rom time to time, by certain movements made in the Senate, hat some new arrangement would be effected by Congress, and he has therefore delayed until the present time addressing your

onorable bodies. But, as no definite movement has been made in either House But, as no definite movement has been made in either House of Congress, and as the pressure upon him is now becoming every cay greater and greater, he thinks it due to Congress, as well as to himself, to give them notice in time to make the necessary arrangements, before he may be compelled to suspend his labors with the public printing now on his hands.

He prays, therefore, with all respect, that Congress would be pleased to grant an inquiry before the joint committee of the two Houses, (as the contract is made under joint resolution,) to ascertain how the contract has been fulfilled, and how the work has been done; and to see what relief may be given to the contractor, and what arrangements may be made for carrying on the Congressional printing with more expedition than ever.

Exclusively of the large portion of the public printing which has been completed, there is still a large quantity on hand, and among these jobs is the 22d volume of the Executive Documents, which is much advanced, and the Patent Office report,

ments, which is much advanced, and the Patent Office report, which is now in the process of being stereotyped.

The contractor begs leave, in the most respectful manner, to remind your honorable bodies, that, even if there had been just cause of complaint against him, in relation to the execution of the contract, he might also allege that he would have been unable to obtain, until the deficiency bill lately passed, any payment for the several jobs, as they were finished off, agreeably to another stipulation in the contract.

Every part of the contract is a losing one, except one clause—and but one job has been done under that clause—and for the amount due for that job under the contract the contractor has deducted nearly two-thirds. Yet, if your honorable bodies would grant him more reasonable terms than the contract callsfor, on the immense mass of work which has been executed, and is now going on, he would most cheerfully throw this job in, and scale it according to the terms which Congress in its wisdom and justice would think fit to allow.

The contractor is perfectly willing to share the large mass.

wisdom and justice would think fit to allow.

The contractor is perfectly willing to share the large mass of printing which is now on hand with any other office which may be designated by your honorable bodies, on the terms which such office may be willing to receive; or, if this be not satisfactory, the undersigned is willing that the work may be placed at the disposal of your honorable bodies, so that such a destination may be given to it, without reference to the contract, as the public interests may require.

WILLIAM M. BELT.

WASHINGTON, JUNE 4, 1850.

Mr. MASON. Whatever may be thought of the reasons-given by the contractor for being thus disabled from complyng with his contract, the fact remains that it is unquest bly necessary that some measures should be taken in rela-

on to the public printing.

Mr. DAYTON. Who is the contractor?

Mr. MASON. William E. Belt. Mr. DAYTON. Who are his sureties?

Mr. MASON. Thomas Ritchie is one, and I thick Thos.
Green is the other. I take it for granted, from conversations which I have had with Thomas Ritchie, although I am not authorized to say so, that he is substantially the contractor. I was about saying that it is indispensably necessary that some steps should be taken in relation to the public printing. I confess that, for my part, with every disposition to hold con-tractors to the fulfilment of the contracts into which they have voluntarily entered, still, from the examination which I have made into the matter, at the instance of the contractor, and from conversations I have had with him, I am satisfied that, under the present contract, he not only receives no remuneration for his work, but sustains constant and daily loss in its execution.

There is another subject to which I would revert very briefly in reference to this contractor, and it is this: I examined the contract yesterday with great care, and though I amined the contract yesterday with great care, and though a have no practical knowledge of printing that would enable me to form an opinion as to where the contractor would gain and where he would lose in the performance of this work, yet I entertain the strongest belief, and I think such is the opinion of the honorable Senator at the head of the Committee on Printing, who is thoroughly informed upon this subject, that on the greater portion a heavy loss must be sustained in its execution. I am informed that there has been but one single document printed by order of Congress during the present session upon which an unusually large profit was made, and